REMARKS

Claims 18-34 remain pending after amendment.

Drawing Amendments

New Figure 1A is submitted.

Specification Amendments

The specification is amended to make reference to new Figure 1A. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly define the claimed invention. At the interview, the Examiner was of the preliminary view that such amendments appeared to be in order. However, the Examiner reserved judgment as to whether such amendments patentably distinguish over the prior art. New claims 33 and 34 are also added directed to preferred embodiments. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Interview with Examiner

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended toward their representative during the interview of April 17, 2006. During the interview, the above amendments to the claims and the new drawing were discussed. While no agreement was

reached regarding the allowance of the claims, it is believed that the above amendments overcome the rejections of the Examiner.

Rejection of Claims 18-26 and 29 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 18-26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Berkel U.S. Patent No. 2,196,371 in view of Hedgpeth. This rejection respectfully is traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

By way of review, the guide of the present invention makes it possible to alter the direction of movement of a piece of work through a power tool such as a saw or router. The direction of such movement is adjusted by altering the angle of the fence on the working surface. To alter the angle, knobs 16 are loosened so that the angle of fence 11 in grooves 12a,b can be altered. Alteration of the angle of the fence produces a like alteration in the direction of travel of applicant's guide since applicant's guide is slidably and rotatably connected to guide rod 20 which, in turn, is connected to the fence.

The Examiner takes the position that the claimed invention is unpatentable over the combination of Van Berkel and Hedgpeth.

Van Berkel's device is used to cut food such as meat and cheese into slices. Cutting involves securing the food by a combined "pusher and clamp" 5. The food is pushed manually by means of handle 8 toward an abutment 6 which controls the thickness of the slices. The direction of travel of the food is controlled by a guide rod, but that direction is not toward the knife but rather toward the "abutment" which feeds the food into the path of the knife.

Applicant's device differs from Van Berkel's fence in several respects. First, the position of applicant's fence is adjustable, whereas Van Berkel's is stationary. Secondly, applicant's guide rod steers the guide toward and away from the cutter, whereas Van Berkel's guide rod steers the guide toward and away from the "abutment".

As a result, applicant's device is suited for a purpose entirely different from Van Berkel's. Applicant's device is used to control the angle of cut in a piece of stock but not, in contrast to Van Berkel's device, the thickness of the cut stock.

The Examiner attempts to combine the teachings of Hedgpeth with those of Van Berkel. However, the combined teachings of the two references still lack a movable fence and a guide rod which steers the stock toward and away from a cutter. In other words, this combination can be distinguished from applicant's device in the same way as Van Berkel is distinguished.

While Hedgpeth's apparatus includes a guide rod, the guide rod is connected to the guide and not to a fence, and is provided for a purpose entirely different from that for which applicant's guide rod is provided. Hedgpeth's guide rod is provided to ensure that a piece of stock is cut to a predetermined length (see page 2, column 2, starting at line 51). Applicant's guide rod, as previously indicated, is provided to permit the angle of travel of the guide to be altered.

While the Examiner takes the position in the Action that Van Berkel discloses a fence "movable across a working surface", applicant believes this to be incorrect. Indeed, the fence and working surface of Van Berkel are comprised of a singular unit. The fence thus cannot move in relation to the working surface, but may instead move in conjunction with

the working surface. Applicant practices the former, and not the latter. Claim 1 is amended to clarify this point.

Further, claim 18 is amended to clarify that the stock supported by the backing block is moved toward and into contact with the cutting tool, and secondly, further in the same direction with resulting further movement of the stock in order to cut the stock, the length of the cut corresponding to the length of further movement of the stock. The Examiner recognized during the interview that such movement to cut the stock is not taught by the cited Van Berkel reference.

Given such differences, and the fact that the combined teachings of the cited prior art do not result in the claimed invention, the rejection is without basis and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27, 28 and 30-32 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 27, 28 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Berkel in view of Hedgpeth and Fontaine. This rejection respectfully is traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

The deficiencies of the cited references are discussed above. Insofar as the rejected claims depend from claim 18, and claim 18 has been shown to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art, this rejection is also without basis and should be withdrawn.

New Claims 33 and 34

As noted above, new claims 33 and 34 are directed to preferred embodiments. Claim 33 provides for means to alter the angle of the fence on the working surface. Claim 34 provides for a cutting tool within the working surface. Both embodiments, taken together with the limitations of claim 18, are believed to be separately patentable.

In view of the above, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

A check in the amount of $120.00 is attached for payment for the requested one month extension of time.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
James W. Hellwege #28,808

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JWH/sh
3918-0156P

Attachment: New Figure 1A

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Add the attached new Figure 1A.